REMARKS

This Supplemental Preliminary Amendment is further to the Preliminary Amendment dated November 3, 2005. Claims 1 to 3, 60, 62, 64 to 69, 74, 75, 77 to 79, 84, 85 and 87 to 89 are pending in the application. Claims 1 to 3, all of which are independent, have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment accorded Applicant's representative during the November 22, 2005 telephonic interview.

During the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed the art of record, particularly U.S. Patent No. 5,778,377 (Marlin). Applicant's representative argued that Marlin is not seen to disclose the claimed feature of displaying partial sheet information, which is a first partial sheet information with regard to a selected network device, on an initial sheet and, when it is determined that displaying of a second sheet is instructed by a user, acquiring second partial sheet information from the selected network device via a network in order to display the second partial information on the second sheet. In particular, Applicants' representative argued that Marlin is seen to disclose acquiring a complete set of information for a device and displaying that information to a user in a single window, rather than displaying partial sheet information as claimed in the present invention.

The Examiner was unwilling to agree that the current rejection under § 103(a) over Marlin and "Windows 95 Printer Driver Operation Manual" (the '95 Manual) should be withdrawn. In particular, the Examiner took the position that column 14, lines

- 11 -

54 to 56 of Marlin, which describes that double-clicking can be used to invoke another report within a window, discloses the claimed feature. Accordingly, no agreement was reached during the interview.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection[1] (see footnote 1 below) are nevertheless again respectfully requested, particularly in view of the amendments above.

The present invention generally concerns acquiring information related to a selected network device of a plurality of network devices, and displaying acquired information of the selected network device. A device window allocated to the selected network device is displayed, the device window having a first sheet, a second sheet, and a designation portion for selecting either the first sheet or the second sheet. The first sheet and the second sheet overlap each other, the sheet selected by the designation portion is visible while the other sheet is invisible, and the first sheet is visible at an initial display stage of the device window. When the device window is displayed, first partial sheet information related to the selected network device is acquired via a network, and the acquired first partial sheet information is displayed on the first sheet of the device window, wherein the first partial sheet information is part of information related to the selected network device. In a case where a user designates the second sheet using the designation portion, second partial sheet information from the selected network device is acquired via the network, and the acquired second partial sheet information is displayed on the second sheet, wherein the second partial sheet information is part of information related to the

---

[1] Claims 1 to 3, 60, 62, 64 to 69, 74, 75, 77 to 79, 84, 85, and 87 to 89 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Marlin and the '95 Manual.

- 12 -

selected network device and is different from the first partial sheet information.

Thus, among its many features, the present invention provides for acquiring and displaying partial sheet information from a selected network device via a network, wherein (i) a designation portion of a device window is used for selecting either a first sheet or second sheet, (ii) the first sheet and the second sheet overlap each other, (iii) the sheet selected by the designation portion is visible while the other sheet is invisible, (iv) the first sheet is visible at an initial display stage of the device window, and (v) partial sheet information is acquired for the second sheet when a user selects the second sheet using the designation portion.

By virtue of the foregoing, in which partial sheet information is acquired and displayed from a selected network device via a network, delay associated with displaying information related to the network device is reduced.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claims 1 to 3 are respectively directed to a method, an apparatus and a computer-readable recording medium.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, Marlin and the '95 Manual are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of acquiring and displaying partial sheet information from a selected network device via a network, wherein (i) a designation portion of a device window is used for selecting either a first sheet or second sheet, (ii) the first sheet and the second sheet overlap each other, (iii) the sheet selected by the designation portion is visible while the other sheet is invisible, (iv) the first sheet is visible

- 13 -

at an initial display stage of the device window, and (v) partial sheet information is acquired for the second sheet when a user selects the second sheet using the designation portion.

As understood by Applicants, Marlin discloses a graphical user interface (GUI) through which a user may define reports and receive on a display requested information from the object-oriented database. See Marlin, column 14, lines 15 to 18. The GUI contains several features, including chain actions, accomplished by double clicking on a particular location in the display. Double clicking may be used to invoke another report, update a dialogue box, display a byte map, etc. See Marlin, column 14, lines 52 to 56.

Although Marlin may be seen to disclose that double clicking can be used to invoke "another" report, nothing in Marlin is seen to disclose that such other report is associated with partial sheet information for a network device, particularly the acquisition of partial sheet information via a network. In fact, Marlin is seen to teach away from acquiring partial sheet information.

In Marlin, single independent windows are seen to be displayed for different network devices, by acquiring information from each of the devices. There is seen to be a one-to-one correspondence between the displayed information and a corresponding window. Marlin is therefore seen to disclose acquiring a complete set of information and then displaying that information to a user in a single window, rather than acquiring partial information. Thus, even if another report is invoked by double clicking, the invocation of the report is not seen to require that partial information be acquired from the network device via the network.

- 14 -

Furthermore, Marlin is not seen to disclose or suggest that (i) a designation portion of a device window is used for selecting either a first sheet or second sheet, (ii) the first sheet and the second sheet overlap each other, (iii) the sheet selected by the designation portion is visible while the other sheet is invisible, (iv) the first sheet is visible at an initial display stage of the device window, and (v) partial sheet information is acquired for the second sheet when a user selects the second sheet using the designation portion.

The '95 Manual is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Marlin. In particular, although the '95 Manual may be seen to disclose a tab interface, the '95 Manual is not seen to disclose or suggest the acquisition and display of sheet information which is partial, with such acquisition of information being from a selected network device via a network. In addition, nothing in the '95 Manual is seen to disclose or suggest that a first sheet is visible at an initial display stage of the device window, and that partial sheet information is acquired for a second sheet when a user selects the second sheet using a designation portion.

As such, even if Marlin and the '95 Manual are combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action (assuming for argument's sake that such combination would be permissible), the result would not teach at least the feature of acquiring and displaying partial sheet information from a selected network device via a network, wherein (i) a designation portion of a device window is used for selecting either a first sheet or second sheet, (ii) the first sheet and the second sheet overlap each other, (iii) the sheet selected by the designation portion is visible while the other sheet is invisible, (iv) the first sheet is

- 15 -

visible at an initial display stage of the device window, and (v) partial sheet information is acquired for the second sheet when a user selects the second sheet using the designation portion.

Moreover, the Office Action contended that it would have been obvious to modify the system of Marlin in view of the tab interface of the '95 manual, in order to enable Marlin's system to "organize the display of the dynamically collected into groups that can be efficiently assessable by the user and conforming to the look-and-feel of the Windows operating system".

Applicants submit that this is a post-hoc rationalization for making the combination, which is not supported by any teachings in the prior art itself. In particular, while it may be a general objective to make data more efficiently assessable, such an objective does not provide any suggestion of the means by which this objective might be attained.

If the Office Action is relying on a "common knowledge" or "well-known art" rationale in asserting that the motivation to combine Marlin and the '95 manual would have been obvious, Applicants respectfully request a citation in support of the position taken in the Office Action. See MPEP § 2144.03.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1 to 3 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the

- 16 -

invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 109402v1

- 17 -